



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,180	09/19/2005	Isabel Plata Andres	P16940-US1	5698
27045	7590	08/25/2008		
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			EXAMINER PATIL, ASHOKKUMAR B	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/517,180

Applicant(s)

PLATA ANDRES ET AL.

Examiner

ASHOK B. PATEL

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-8 are subject to examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 06/10/1008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Applicant's argument:

The cited portion explains the advantages of SIP but, does not disclose receiving a service request comprising a first identifier and then selecting a second identifier from among a plurality of identifiers in a stored collection of identifiers. The Detailed Action recites an example that purports to be a second identifier, "phone_number@gateway". The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The example is noted as one of the forms that SIP uses for a party identifier, not as a selected second identifier that is included in the user-name portion."

Further, Rosenberg teaches away from obtaining a plurality of identifiers related to a given identifier (see para [0046]. The Applicant respectfully submits that the obtained identifier does not comprise a user-name portion that contains the first identifier. This being the case, neither the AAPA nor Rosenberg, individually or in combination teaches or suggests the limitation of selecting a second identifier and including the first identifier in the user-name portion of the second identifier."

Dalgic does not teach or suggest selection of a second identifier with a format that comprises a user-name portion containing a first identifier."

Examiner's response:

Examiner discerns that the "at least one identifier" has a format that comprises a user-name portion and a domain-name portion, wherein the user-name portion contains said first identifier **since Claim 1 recites** "at least one identifier among said plurality of identifiers stored in step a)" has a format that comprises a user-name portion and a domain-name portion, wherein the user-name portion contains said first identifier.

And since the claim further recites that "in step d) said second identifier is selected having a format comprising a user-name portion and a domain-name portion, wherein said user-name portion contains said first identifier" and "e) routing said service request according to said selected second identifier", the "second identifier is the "at least one identifier."

AAPA teaches, as previously indicated, at para. [00011] and [00012]:

[00011] According to RFC2916, a plurality of identifiers are stored in a data base. Said data base is structured and accessed (queried) using the well-known DNS technology. For this purpose the received E.164 identifier is arranged (as described below) to query a DNS-based data base in a similar manner as other DNS-based queries are done. Since the domain "e164.arpa" is being populated to provide the infrastructure in DNS systems for storage of E.164 numbers, said domain identifier is included in the query. For example, for a received E.164 identifier such as:

9876543210 (a method for routing a service request in a telecommunication system towards a destination user and receiving a service request that comprises said first identifier)

the next query is should be made to a DNS:

0.1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9.e164.arpa

wherein the received digits in the E.164 identifier have been inverted to fulfill existing DNS structured analysis (structured hierarchically from right to left). As a result a plurality of URLs that are stored in the DNS in relationship with said E.164 identifier are received as a result of said query. Each of these URLs can be related to a specific service, although more than one can be related to the same service. **(storing a collection of identifiers related to a first identifier assigned to said user)** For example, the query can yield a set of identifiers such as:

sip: John.Doe@OperatorA.se (a SIP-URL)

tel: +98-7-6543210 (a TEL-URL)

fax: +98-7-6543210 (a FAX-URL)

mailto: John.Doe@OperatorA.se (a MAILTO-URL)

sip: JohnnyDoe@OperatorB.fr (a SIP-URL)

that are stored in DNS as NAPTR RRs (Naming Authority Pointer DNS Resource Records), and that can be used as valid routable identifiers for further routing the service request that contained the E.164 identifier **(obtaining a plurality of identifiers among said collection of identifiers)**.

[00012] Among said identifiers, the querying entity (for example, a node in the telecommunication service) can select one of them and further route the service request according to it. For example, the most appropriate URL for delivering the requested service can be selected according to the requested capabilities; so for example, if the

service requested is a voice call, then any SIP-URL can be selected for delivering it into a SIP-enabled terminal of the referenced destination user. Alternatively, the second URL (tel:+98-7-6543210) could be selected if it is desired to deliver the call, for example, to a plain telephone set through a legacy telephony system. **(selecting a second identifier among said plurality of identifiers and routing said service request according to said selected second identifier.)**

Please note that Examiner had **never** cited Rosenberg for teaching "selection of a second identifier" which , as indicated above, is already taught by AAPA.

Examiner had cited Rosenberg for the **following teachings/reasons** which were specifically underlined to insist upon it's paramount importance for one having ordinary skills in the art.

Para. [0038] Network addresses **within SIP are not restricted to being Internet address, but could also be E. 164 PSTN** addresses (i.e., conventional telephone numbers), OSI addresses, or even privately created numbering plans.

Para. [0041] In order to be invited to a call, **the called party must have an identification by which it can be addressed.** Since the most common form of user addressing on the Internet is the email type address, SIP uses party identifiers in the form of, for example, "user@domain," "user@host," "user@IP_address," or **"phone number@gateway."** [0042] The domain name can be either the name of the host that a user is logged into at the time, an email address, or the name of a domain-specific name translation service. As can be expected, an address in the form of

Art Unit: 2154

"phone_number@gateway" designates a PSTN phone number reachable via the named gateway."

Thus, Rosenberg teaches "second identifier a format comprising a user-name portion and a domain-name portion, wherein said user-name portion contains said first identifier."

Thus, the manner of the routing of a service request in a telecommunication system towards a destination user was made part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of Rosenberg. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying this known technique **(that is of formatting second identifier in a format comprising a user-name portion and a domain-name portion, wherein said user-name portion contains said first identifier)** in the same manner to the prior art as that of Rosenberg and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art, namely, one skilled in the art would have readily recognized that the network addresses within SIP (a service request) are not restricted to being Internet address, but could also be E. 164 PSTN addresses (i.e., conventional telephone numbers), such as "phone_number@gateway" to reach the destination reliably without failure within a telecommunication system offering a desirable quality of service to its users or subscribers.

Examiner had **never** cited Dalgic teaching or suggesting selection of a second identifier with a format that comprises a user-name portion containing a first identifier.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being Unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA) in view of Rosenberg et al. (hereinafter Rosenberg) (US 2005/0207361 A1)

Referring to claim 1,

AAPA teaches a method for routing a service request in a telecommunication system towards a destination user (page 6, para, [0012]), the method comprising the steps of:

- a) storing a collection of identifiers related to a first identifier assigned to said user (page 6, para. [0011]);
 - b) receiving a service request that comprises said first identifier (page 6, para. [0011];
 - c) obtaining a plurality of identifiers among said collection of identifiers (page 6, para. [0011];
 - d) selecting a second identifier among said plurality of identifiers (page 6, para, [0012]);
- and

Art Unit: 2154

e) routing said service request according to said selected second identifier (page 6, para, [0012]);

AAPA fails to teach the method characterized in that:

at least one identifier among said plurality of identifiers stored in step a) has a format that comprises a user-name portion and a domain-name portion, wherein the user-name portion contains said first identifier; and

in step d) said second identifier is selected having a format comprising a user-name portion and a domain-name portion, wherein said user-name portion contains said first identifier.

Rosenberg teaches the method characterized in that:

at least one identifier among said plurality of identifiers stored in step a) has a format that comprises a user-name portion and a domain-name portion, wherein the user-name portion contains said first identifier; and

in step d) said second identifier is selected having a format comprising a user-name portion and a domain-name portion, wherein said user-name portion contains said first identifier. (para. [0038] As mentioned above, SIP advantageously makes minimal assumptions about the underlying transport protocol being used for Internet telephony, especially with regard to reliability. It can use any datagram or stream protocol. The only restriction on function is that a SIP request or response must be transmitted in full or not at all. SIP can therefore be used with UDP or TCP in the Internet, and with X.25, AAL5/ATM, CLNP, TP4, IPX, or PPP elsewhere. Network addresses within SIP are not restricted to being Internet address, but could also be E.

164 PSTN addresses (i.e., conventional telephone numbers), OSI addresses, or even privately created numbering plans. [0039] In addition, it should be noted that SIP is not tied to the existence of a TCP connection, so that a call can be maintained even if a calling party loses their Internet connection and must reboot, as long as the respective end systems can maintain call identifiers associated with the call. [0040] First, the issue of user addresses and naming will be discussed. [0041] In order to be invited to a call, **the called party must have an identification by which it can be addressed.** Since the most common form of user addressing on the Internet is the email type address, SIP uses party identifiers in the form of, for example, "user@domain," "user@host," "user@IP_address," or **"phone_number@gateway."** [0042] The domain name can be either the name of the host that a user is logged into at the time, an email address, or the name of a domain-specific name translation service. As can be expected, an address in the form of "phone_number@gateway" designates a PSTN phone number reachable via the named gateway.", **Note:** "at least one identifier among said plurality of identifiers" is the "second identifier." Here, according to Rosenberg, "phone_number@gateway" is the "second identifier.")

Thus, the manner of the routing of a service request in a telecommunication system towards a destination user was made part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of Rosenberg. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying this known technique in the same manner to the prior art as that of Rosenberg and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art, namely, one skilled in the art would have

readily recognized that the network addresses within SIP (a service request) are not restricted to being Internet address, but could also be E. 164 PSTN addresses (i.e., conventional telephone numbers), such as "phone_number@gateway" to reach the destination reliably without failure within a telecommunication system offering a desirable quality of service to its users or subscribers..

Referring to claim 2,

AAPA teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step c) further comprises the steps of: c1) sending a query to a database that contains said collection of identifiers related to said first identifier, said query comprising the content of the first identifier; c2) receiving a response to said query that comprises a plurality of identifiers among said collection of identifiers (para. [0011]).

Referring to claim 3,

AAPA teaches the method of claims 1 or 2, wherein said first identifier is a E.164 number and said second identifier is a Uniform Resource Locator for Session Initiation Protocol. (para. [0004]).

Referring to claim 5,

Claim 5 is an apparatus that incorporates and implements the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 1.

Referring to claim 6,

Claim 6 is a system that incorporates and implements the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 6 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 1.

Referring to claim 7,

Claim 7 is a system that incorporates and implements the method of claim 3. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 3.

5. Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being Unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA) in view of Rosenberg et al. (hereinafter Rosenberg) (US 2005/0207361 A1) C as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dalgic et al. ("True number portability and advanced call screening in a SIP-based IP telephony system.", hereinafter Dalgic).

Referring to claim 4,

Keeping in mind the teachings of AAPA and Rosenberg as stated in claim 1 above, both of the references fail to teach the method of claim 3, wherein said second identifier contains number portability information.

Dalgic teaches wherein said second identifier contains number portability information (page 98 and 99, **Note: Please note that SIP URL includes the phone number and domain name, along with the main SIP server and the gateway functionality**).

Thus, the manner of the routing of a service request in a telecommunication system towards a destination user was made part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of Dalgic in addition to Rosengerg. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying this known technique in the same manner to the prior art as that of Dalgic and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art, namely, one skilled in the art would have readily recognized that the network addresses within SIP (a service

request) are not restricted to being Internet address, but could also be E. 164 PSTN addresses (i.e., conventional telephone numbers), such as "phone_number@gateway" with the number portability information to reach the destination reliably without failure within a telecommunication system offering a desirable quality of service to its users or subscribers.

Referring to claim 8,

Claim 8 is a system that incorporates and implements the method of claim 4. Therefore, claim 8 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 4.

Conclusion

Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ASHOK B. PATEL whose telephone number is (571)272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan A. Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ashok B. Patel/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154